

**PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
of the
Suffolk County Legislature**

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Public Works & Transportation Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on **January 22, 2003**.

Members Present:

Legislator Joseph Caracappa - Chairman
Legislator Brian Foley - Vice-Chair
Legislator Andrew Crecca
Legislator Fred Towle
Legislator George Guldi
Legislator William Lindsay

Also in Attendance:

Paul Sabatino - Counsel to the Legislature
Kellianne Sacchitello - Aide to Legislator Caracappa
Tim Motz - Aide to Presiding Officer Postal
Tim Laube - Aide to Legislator Lindsay
John Ortiz - Budget Analyst/Budget Review Office
Nicole DeAngelo - Intergovernmental Relations/County Executive Office
Charles Bartha - Commissioner/Suffolk County Public Works Department
Richard LaValle - Chief Deputy Commissioner/SC Public Works Department
Ben Wright - Director of Sanitation/SC Department of Public Works
Bill Shannon - Director of Highways/SC Department of Public Works
Thomas Isles - Director/Suffolk County Planning Department
Emi Endo - Newsday

Minutes Taken By:

Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer

1

(*The meeting was called to order at 2:36 P.M.*)

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Good afternoon, everybody. I would like to start the Public Works and Transportation Committee for the year 2003 with a salute to the flag led by new member, Legislator Lindsay.

Salutation

Good afternoon, everybody. This is the first meeting of the year of the Public Works and Transportation Committee. The makeup of the

committee this year is slightly different than last year and I'd like to welcome members Legislator Guldi, Legislator Crecca who is returning, Legislator Foley who is returning, Legislator Lindsay, and I believe Legislator --

MS. SACCHITELLO:
Towle.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Towle, correct.

LEG. CRECCA:
You want to welcome Freddy Towle?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
I'll welcome him when he comes, if he makes it in time; you know I run a quick meeting. And myself and I'm very glad and happy to be back as Chairman this year, for which I didn't think was going to be the case.

We have a presentation, first and foremost, by Tom Isles, Director of Planning. We're going to discuss the official map of the County which is a project he's undertaking now and he'd like to update the committee as to where he is now, where he is going and how long it will take him to get to that point.

DIRECTOR ISLES:
Great, thank you. I think you just about made my presentation, but thank you for the opportunity, Legislator Caracappa and the members of the committee.

Just by way of a very brief background, I just wanted to bring this committee up-to-date on the County official map. New York State Law enables all counties and localities to create official maps and an official map, just to define what that is, it's a planning tool or a planning device that municipalities can use to plan for future growth, and specifically it's most often used for developing areas where let's say they're on a rural fringe area, they want to plan future road corridors, a municipality can place those road corridors on a map legislatively and then have the ability to protect those corridors from development such as having the ability to deny the issuance of building permits and so forth. It also becomes a planning tool in the sense that as development is occurring, subdivisions and commercial development and so forth, the localities, the towns and villages, can then work around that knowing what the future road plans are. So the basic purpose of the official map is to reserve land for future needs.

I will point out that in addition to highway planning which is primarily what official maps are used for, they can also be used to

map out future areas for drainage systems such as recharge basins, they can also be used for mapping out land required for County facilities such as County buildings. It also includes the ability to use it for mapping out lands for Federal and State facilities as well. And then lastly, it could also be used for mapping parkland which is not done very often, but hypothetically and by not only State enabling legislation but also by the County Charter, the County can map out future parkland as well as highway corridors and so forth.

The specific involvement of the Planning Department in this matter is that the County Charter has contained the ability to create an official map going back to the 1960's. I think the last amendment was in 1970 and it talks about the official map as being a document that would specify, as I said, future road corridors, County Capital Projects, Federal and State Capital Projects and so forth. In 1999 a resolution was approved by the Legislature assigning the responsibility for doing an official map to the Planning Department and then giving us a time frame for when that had to be done, and the time frame is that we are obligated, the Planning Department is obligated to have a map to the Legislature on January 15th of 2005, so we have about two years to go on this at this point. The Legislature is required to act on that document by the end of 2006, it's a pretty comfortable time frame, however time has a way of flying.

And what I wanted to do is to bring you up-to-date that we are now in the process of getting the resources together to do this project both within the office and any Capital or Operating Budget money we may need to request for next year. We've also obviously been in discussions with the Department of Public Works to see what resources they have in terms of their electronic mapping of their highway system, that might help us get a head start on this.

And then lastly, it's to -- in addition to providing this update to the committee, I'd also like to invite any comments that any of the committee members may have, not necessarily immediately but we will be fine tuning a work plan for this in the next couple of months of any feedback that you had would be welcomed. And I think what that will help us do as both -- as I'm working with the Commissioner of Public Works as well as with this committee, we will be fine tuning exactly what we will be focusing on. There are statutory requirements of what the map must contain, but as we know, we're not in a situation now where the County is growing in leaps and bounds geographically so we don't think we're going to be using this as a major planning tool in terms of mapping out new highway corridors to any great degree, so that probably will not be a large emphasis.

But here again, we are required to show existing County, State and Federal highways roads and parkways, all County and State and Federal owned land, all water courses and major drainage structures, all Capital Projects in the program, Capital Program that are appropriate

to the official map. As I mentioned previously, all State and Federal Capital Projects. So I think what we'd like to do is find out and fine tune what is most important and helpful to us as a planning document in the future for the official map and make sure that those are done

3

in a manner that will be most useful in the future. Those that are less important to us as a County, we would put less energy into that.

So that's essentially it in a nutshell in terms of what we're doing with the official map and, as I said, we welcome any comments you may have as we proceed in the next couple of months to develop a work plan. Thank you.

LEG. GULDI:
I have a question.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Okay, I have a question. When is a ball park outside date for comment you think you can give us? You said a couple of months.

DIRECTOR ISLES:
Let's say the end of the first quarter, how's that?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
End of the first, okay.

DIRECTOR ISLES:
Yeah, so maybe by April if we can kind of complete the process of defining what the project is, that would help.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Very good. Legislator Guldi.

LEG. GULDI:
Actually, first is a question and then there's another question. The first question is you indicated the official map can be used, I think in your remarks you said as a tool for denying building permits.

DIRECTOR ISLES:
Yes.

LEG. GULDI:
How does the official map achieve that result without putting the County as the propounder of the map into a de factor condemnation proceeding regarding the properties that are targeted for future highway, future park or other future governmental purposes?

DIRECTOR ISLES:

That's a good question and I think that's -- I was involved in the use of this planning tool when I was with the Town of Islip at one point. When the State of New York had proposed a widening of Sunrise Highway for many years, in excess of 20 years, going from the Connetquot State Park to the Brookhaven Town line. We were in a situation where we would have applications come in for development within that corridor, we would know darn well that the taking line was established by the State and that eventually they would come in and take that property, pay the property owners and we were concerned about the impact of that in terms of the loss of buildings, the loss of parking lots and so forth. As you go to let's say points west in the Town of Islip or Babylon where the buildings were right up on the service road, that's a situation most likely where the buildings were built, they had

4

parking, the highway came through later on and the parking was eliminated. What we did do is we suggested to the Town Board that they actually map the State taking line on the official map of the Town of Islip which the Town Board did, and from that point on we were able to require that all development be out of the taking area.

In terms of the issue of compensation which obviously is an appropriate and fair issue for the property owners, we were fortunate in that case that the State of New York had a plan and intention in the Capital Program to compensate property owners and it actually worked quite well. The time frame was probably a seven year time frame between when we mapped it and when the project moved forward, but it was an example where it worked fine. I think your point is well taken in the sense that the legislation requires that property owners, if we're denying a building permit or a locality is denying a building permit, there has to be the option to go for a variance to go for a hardship and to have relief in that manner. I think that's part of the reason why it also has to be matched to the capital plan, that there has to be some real intention to move forward with the program.

Just the last point I will make, not to belabor it either, is that -- Legislator Guldi, I'm sure you're aware of this -- that there are a lot of old filed maps around in the County, especially in the Pine Barrens and so forth. And that's really an example of an official map of sorts in the sense that municipalities can deny the issuance of a building permit within any of those mapped streets; it creates a messy situation but it's not that uncommon in the sense that it's been done in the past quite extensively.

LEG. GULDI:

Yeah, but we should be cognizant of the fact that --

DIRECTOR ISLES:

Yeah.

LEG. GULDI:

-- if we propound a map that de facto that precludes the use of beneficial ownership of large tracts of land, we're going to be required without benefit of a State program to put up the money to come up with the Capital funds to compensate those owners in the course of what we're doing.

DIRECTOR ISLES:

Yeah, you're right. Because the one difference on the file maps is that those are subdivisions where the property owner put it on the map and then sold off lots where they knew darn well there were roads. I think that brings up the point that the legislation gives the ability to map future parkland or open space and I think that would probably a very difficult thing to do from the standpoint you're raising in terms of compensation.

So as we're looking at it, as I'm looking at this project and what I'm requiring to do and deliver to the Legislature, one question would then be on the issue of parkland is that something we should consider mapping in an extensive way and I think that's a particular problem

5

that we would probably want to avoid, unless we know for certain that we're actually going to move ahead with a parkland acquisition.

LEG. GULDI:

Yeah. The second question I have, unless you want -- you're on this point?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yeah, on this point.

LEG. GULDI:

Yeah, go ahead. Why don't you go on this point because my other point is not related.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I'm sorry.

LEG. CRECCA:

No, go, go ahead.

LEG. LINDSAY:

What I was going to ask, Tom, is we build this new map with projected new roadways and existing roadways of maybe new parkland or our best guess at parkland, it still goes back to the respective towns on whether they want to issue a building permit to build in that area; am I correct or not correct?

DIRECTOR ISLES:

Right. There's --

LEG. LINDSAY:

So who's going to get sued; we're going to get sued or is the town or both of us?

DIRECTOR ISLES:

Well, there is a requirement for notification to the County Planning Commission if it is affecting or within an officially mapped road or park or parcel of some sort. I'm not going to answer the legal question in terms of would we get sued or not, I would imagine that if we are -- a reason why a town is not issuing a building permit that we would have to answer to that and be accountable to that.

LEG. LINDSAY:

But the other side of this is that if we didn't go forward with this and there was no document to outline where future roadways are, it's going to cost government more money somewheres along the line because people are going to build on that and then the property is going to be condemned as developed property at a future date.

DIRECTOR ISLES:

That's precisely the reason for the official map, it actually talks about that in the Legislative Intent. I think really what would have to be done is that it would have to be done in a very short time horizon meaning that we'd have to know pretty certainly that we are planning a road corridor or a widening. And here again, in my discussions with Public Works are that we don't anticipate a large

scale County highway improvement project where we're going to be creating a lot of new roadways. As part of this process we would certainly consult with Public Works, inquire as to any planned roadway expansions, new roads or widenings that should be mapped and I think we would do it in a conservative manner meaning that we would have a pretty high sense that these were actually going to go forward. So this would not be something speculative where we would say, "Well, maybe in 30 or 50 years we're going to do a highway that's going to run from Riverhead to Patchogue or something." It would have to be I think pretty well tied into the Capital Program where there are planned milling projects.

And part of this is a little bit of -- you know, I did this in the Town of Islip with the town map which was at a different level. Since we don't have a current County official map, we're kind of going into the unknown a little bit, so that's part of the reason why we're doing this process of having a discussion, seeking your input to define what

this product should be.

LEG. GULDI:

Can I go back to my other issue?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Sure.

LEG. GULDI:

In my district, County Road 39 has -- was built by the County as the bypass for the Montauk Highway route to connect what was the proposed future State Highway of Route 27 at that time to bypass the traffic from Montauk Highway. It's become such a bad bottleneck that the local roads have become the bypass for the bypass and the trade parade as it's known backs up County Road 39 such that it takes longer for me to get from my home in Westhampton Beach, 17 miles away, to Southampton Town Hall in the morning than it does for me to get from West Hampton Beach to the courthouses in Islip more than 30 miles away.

The lack of a map 20 years ago for a plan for the additional highway for the growth that occurred through that Shinnecock Canal Narrows area precisely the kind of problem that we seek to avoid with this kind of map. Because, you know, the alternatives for building the roadway now or additional roadway now through that area include elimination of the Long Island Railroad and/or the construction of tunnels, for lack of better planning.

The question, though, in terms of grappling with that issue which is very much a current issue and what's going on on Route 58 in Riverhead, it's becoming one of the busiest highways in the County and frankly subject to huge development pressure and future demands, will those two projects be within the scope of what you're doing now or are those already Public Works projects in progress?

DIRECTOR ISLES:

To the extent of any information we can apply regarding a road widening, that could potentially be mapped. However, I do want to make the point that this is not intended to be a detailed engineering

or traffic study of every road in the County because that's not something that's within the scope or we really do with this. I think this is intended to be more of a broad brushed, maybe not completely broad but examination of more of the big picture of perhaps looking at what you were saying, 20 years ago on County Road 39 that as we look 20 years into the future where are the locations where areas are not developed whereby we could map in a County Road not going through buildings and houses and things like that where we feel that there's a

reasonable likelihood that that is needed in the future.

So I think it's going to be more specific, I think it might apply to maybe a very limited selection of new road corridors and from what I've heard from Public Works, not a heck of a lot on that. Possibly the road widenings, that could be mapped in and that would probably be more likely. The legislation does talk about defining the rights-of-way of these roads, too, and mapping those so it's defined as to what the County's intentions are.

LEG. GULDI:

To address Legislator Lindsay's concern, we do have kind of some history about what happens in these situations. Frankly, out at Suffolk County Airport we, the County, as airport sponsor had an obligation to secure an additional area around the airport for noise buffers. The area in East Quogue to the east of the airport was zoned for residential development, the County in fulfillment or in an effort to fulfill its obligation to acquire that land passed a planning document that said don't let anyone build there and informed the town. The town, when it was faced with the subdivision application from the applicant to develop the luxury housing on that site, said essentially to the County, "What are you crazy? If we deny the permit we're going to get sued and have to buy it." So they instead required covenants and easements notifying the land owners on the subdivided lot that you're next door to an airport and there are going to be airplanes. By putting it in covenants and easements, nobody, nobody was aware of it until such time as they had already picked out the furniture and the curtains and were ready to close the transaction. So now that community, surprisingly, is a source of major noise complaints about the airport.

So the planning document where we took the planning step instead of the acquisition step -- well, arguably we should have taken the acquisition step -- when we notified the town, the town merely punted it back and didn't put up the money and granted the subdivision permits which frankly is not an unlikely result absent a bona fide Capital Program to implement the plan.

(*Legislator Towle entered the meeting at 2:55 P.M.*)

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Legislator Crecca.

LEG. CRECCA:

Tom, I just wanted to add, I don't know to what extent there's mapping done by the Water Authority to protect our aquifer system and all that, but that certainly given the uniqueness of that with this

County, it's at least something that I would ask Planning to consider in the mapping process, that's all.

DIRECTOR ISLES:

It's a good point. And we certainly do have that base of special groundwater protection areas and so forth and that would be applied.

LEG. CRECCA:

Even where the keywells are and things like that and the need for security with them and all that, so.

DIRECTOR ISLES:

Right, okay.

LEG. CRECCA:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Any other questions on this? Mr. Isles, thank you.

DIRECTOR ISLES:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

We will be hearing from you in the future I'm sure on this.

Commissioner Bartha, would you like to come up? Deputy Commissioner LaValle.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

As we enter a new year, Charlie, is there anything you would like to state to the committee at this point in time?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I look forward to working proactively with the committee. If there's any issues that you feel need to be addressed at any time, please contact myself, Chief Deputy or the Deputy and we'd be glad to address them, no need to wait for a meeting of course to contact us.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Okay, very good. For those members who are new to the committee, a longstanding tradition started by Legislator Foley and continued by myself last year was to ask the Commissioner or have the opportunity as committee members to ask the Commissioner about any Capital Projects that might be going on in your district. So feel free if anybody has any questions to ask the Commissioner at this point in time.

LEG. TOWLE:

We don't have enough time today.

LEG. GULDI:

We'll schedule a separate appointment.

9

LEG. FOLEY:

We might as well start the year as we ended it last year, Mr. Chairman. And while we all have our lists of projects that we will soon be speaking with you and your appropriate staff about, at least for today I can bring up at least initially a project that's an important one that straddles both my district and Legislator Lindsay's district which is on County Road 19. We had appropriated monies for sidewalk construction just south of the Expressway on the west side of County Road 19 and it's our hope and expectation that the department could start that project once the warmer weather arrives as opposed to waiting till the summer or the fall. Because it's an important pedestrian safety project, we have the monies available, we had spoken to Mr. Shannon. And I know the department is ready, willing and able to move forward, we just would like to say that we'd like to see it move as quickly as possible at an earliest date as possible in order to give those pedestrians the opportunity to walk on the sidewalk as opposed to the shoulder or just the present access point there. Okay? Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We'll get back to you with a schedule on that.

LEG. FOLEY:

Yeah, thank you.

LEG. LINDSAY:

You know, I want to put my name on the sidewalk.

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

Edged in with a little plaque?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Legislator Towle.

LEG. TOWLE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just had one issue; have we removed the Smith Point Bridge to prevent anybody from getting to Legislator Foley's district in Smith Point Park? I'm curious if the bridge has been removed yet.

No, actually the issue I wanted to bring up was the parking lot. Although in Legislator Foley's district I continue to suffer the

number of calls as to what are we going to do with that parking lot and I've decided that if we don't resolve that pretty shortly I'm going to start forwarding all the calls to Legislator Foley's house directly. What type of thoughts do you guys have? I mean, I know we have an extensive Capital Program but we really need to do something to improve some of that parking lot condition despite the fact that that project is out there looming.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We presented a number of alternatives last year with different costs. We agree with you that something should be done there and it's a matter of how much money is appropriated.

10

LEG. FOLEY:

It has been appropriated.

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

I know some of that was held off primarily pending the completion of the master plan. As you know, we are finalizing that --

LEG. TOWLE:

I saw the draft.

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

-- and the erosion in that area is a prime concern. Once we've developed that master plan and determined, in fact, what we are going to do with the park in terms of the pavilion and what have you and the erosion control techniques that we would use, that would kind of give us a better feel for what level of improvements we should be doing in the parking area. And as we had indicated to both yourself and to Legislator Foley, as soon as we have finalized that, we plan to sit down with you and review the master plan before we actually publish it.

LEG. TOWLE:

The issue from my perspective is obviously there's three points to be. Point one is a complete redoing of the parking lot on one end, on the other end, you know, just some type of slurry seal or a coating over the parking lot. And then kind of in the middle of the road where I thought we were with the resolution that I had filed last year, if we were to move or approve a Capital Program for Smith Point over a three or four or five or six year period regarding the erosion and moving of the building, I mean, I think, you know, three, four, five, six years is reasonable as to how long all that's going to take; in fact it may be longer. And from my perspective, to leave the parking lot in the condition it's in for another summer to charge people \$8 to park in a lot that has, you know, lakes in the middle of it, grass growing out of the parking lot, no striping, and \$5 for residents for that type of

a facility is just ridiculous to me. And you know we really need to move forward with something on that.

Legislator Foley mentioned that we had approved some money at the last meeting of the year and I remember that happening.

LEG. FOLEY:

Yep.

LEG. TOWLE:

I'm just curious, what --

LEG. FOLEY:

Yeah, it was my understanding -- if we can hear from the department, through the Chair -- it's my understanding that the resolution we approved at the end of last year will allow for the central part of that parking area which is completely let's say grown over with grass and there's no asphalt left, that the monies that you've had appropriated would at least have you take care of that particular area, do some drainage improvements there and also allow some crack

11

sealing to occur throughout the rest of the parking lot prior to the next summer season; is that not correct?

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

Well, the intent was to -- as a minimum.

LEG. FOLEY:

Right.

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

Was to repair the center of the parking lot.

LEG. FOLEY:

Before the next summer season.

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

Put in some drainage --

LEG. FOLEY:

Correct.

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

-- and do certain types of --

LEG. FOLEY:

And pave it over, pave that particular portion over as well as crack sealing; is that not correct? I mean, that's the kind of -- let me

put it this way, that's the conversation that you and I had.

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

Yeah, I think -- yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

That that work was going to be done prior to the next summer season.

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

Presuming that money is there, and I'm not --

LEG. FOLEY:

Right.

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

That's something we have to check on as to the funding with the Parks Department, whether that's in place.

LEG. FOLEY:

When I had spoken with the new Commissioner at the end of last year, it was my understanding that the intention of the Parks Department was in fact to do just that, take care of the problem in the middle, do some crack sealing, also that there's a little dock, a fishing dock they want to put on the north side of the barrier island as a minimum. And that would at least temporarily address the issue that Legislator Towle and I have had over the years about the condition of the parking lot.

12

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

As far as that, the boardwalk or what have you, the fishing pier --

LEG. FOLEY:

Yes.

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

-- that is presently being designed by the consultant, so that we are moving ahead with.

LEG. FOLEY:

Mr. Chairman, what I will do -- and Legislator Towle, I believe you're on the Parks Committee, Legislator Towle?

LEG. TOWLE:

No, I am not.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay. I'll bring up --

LEG. TOWLE:

After six committees I couldn't serve on any more.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay. I will bring this very issue up at the next Parks Committee meeting in order to determine what their intentions are. But legislator Towle, you had it absolutely right, that some of that work was supposed to be done prior to next summer season.

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

We have a meeting with the Parks Department tomorrow, we meet with them on a monthly basis to review their projects and we'll discuss that with them tomorrow.

LEG. FOLEY:

Thank you.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Mr. Chairman, can you put me on the list?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

You're it.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Raynor Park, the bid opening, it seemed like it was pretty good; you guys, any comments, were the bids all right?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Well, we had a very large number of bids which is normally a good sign. The bids for the total project were over the amount appropriated, however we have a number of deducts, alternates in there that I expect we will be able to go over that, you know, remove certain items in order to come up with -- be able to award a contract.

13

LEG. LINDSAY:

Didn't we have a \$2 million budget on that, total, do you know; do you remember, Joe?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

With planning and construction I believe it was two million.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay, so planning was in that already so that's why. Because I was figuring that two million number and it was all of them together but below the two million. Maybe when you get into the deducts, there's three Legislators on that area that, you know, maybe you can just --

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

The intent was --

LEG. LINDSAY:

Or Parks; who would do that, you guys or Parks?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We would do it in conjunction with Parks.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay.

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

But my understanding is once we've determined what we think should be done, then we would be coming back to the committee which three Legislators and I think some representatives from the community to advise them as to what we're proposing to eliminate at this point from the contract and get a consensus and then move ahead from there.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Rich --

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

Possibly in the future, if the Legislature comes up with more money we can kind of go out with another contract if we had to to accomplish the rest of the project.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay. And roughly -- I know some of the minor contracts were below estimates, I think the GC was over about 200,000.

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

I think what happens when you put the total together --

LEG. LINDSAY:

The total was probably just about 150 over or something like that?

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

I don't recall the numbers.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay.

14

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

So we'll address that and we'll be in touch.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Do you think this would delay the project at all?

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

No, no, it shouldn't.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Because the deducts are all in the contract.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Right, right.

CHIEF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER LAVALLE:

No, it shouldn't delay the project. Yeah, everything is in.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

The numbers are close enough that given a project that size we think we can work with it. As Richard said, we'll come back to you --

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

-- and the other members.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay, thanks.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Okay. Any other questions by committee members?

LEG. CRECCA:

No.

LEG. TOWLE:

No.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Any other comments? We're going to the agenda, we have one resolution pending.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

It's a Tabled Resolution, 2230-02 (P) - Authorizing execution of an agreement by the Administration Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest with the Developer of New York Power Authority Brentwood Facility (County Executive). This was tabled last year at the request of Legislator Carpenter. I know she's still in -- she hasn't reached out to me yet, I don't know if she's reached out to you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

She had indicated what she was interested in, we have -- we didn't get her the letter that she was looking for but I have it with me now. She was interested as to whether PP&L was included with this project, they are not; they're not part of the NYPA project at all nor would they be connecting into this sewer line that would be constructed under this. This project would bring \$150,000 connection fee revenue to the Southwest Sewer District that would be used towards a Capital Improvement Fund that we have, as well as paying the annual user charges and annual debt service on properties.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Legislator Foley.

LEG. FOLEY:

Now at the Brentwood facility, who are the potential connectees to this particular facility?

LEG. GULDI:

You mean under this --

LEG. FOLEY:

Not only potential, who are the -- what connectees -- who intends to connect to this particular facility?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

NYPA has an existing generating facility in the area, that's what this is for, for them to connect. They -- and as I said, it's existing, it generates about 10,000 gallons per day.

LEG. FOLEY:

It's only for NYPA?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Correct.

LEG. FOLEY:

That's the only connection.

LEG. GULDI:

Legislator Foley, may I interject?

LEG. FOLEY:

Sure.

LEG. GULDI:

The 10,000 gallons a day, is that -- that's cooling water for the generators, it's an unmanned facility; is that correct, or is this used for something else?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I have to check with Ben Wright on that.

LEG. GULDI:

Ten thousand gallons a day of what from an unmanned facility, that's what I want to know.

16

MR. WRIGHT:

It's not unmanned.

LEG. FOLEY:

Use the Mike, Ben.

MR. WRIGHT:

We consider it like a pumping station where it's -- there is staff there daily but they don't stay there for the full day.

LEG. GULDI:

Yeah, I understand that.

MR. WRIGHT:

But they're discharging --

LEG. GULDI:

But 10,000 gallons a day is based on what kind of --

MR. WRIGHT:

Well, that's their estimate for sanitary waste as well it is cooling water and other processed water that cannot be discharged to the ground directly.

LEG. GULDI:

How much cooling water and what's the nature and quality of the water?

MR. WRIGHT:

We have an engineering report that I don't have with me that met our standards for discharge.

LEG. GULDI:

Could you give me a synopsis of the report? I mean, the stuff's not oil contaminant, it's just cooling water.

MR. WRIGHT:

No, no, it's maybe total dissolved solids, some nutrients that are within it, nothing that was hazardous in any respect.

LEG. GULDI:

In fact, wouldn't the addition to the waste water treatment plant of

the cooling water, substantially cooling water without solids in it essentially assist the operation of the plant?

MR. WRIGHT:

No, I mean, it's not clean enough that it can go directly to the groundwater so it has to go to some kind of treatment facility.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I think Legislator Guldi's question is would the strength of the sewage that's coming from this facility be more or less than the --

LEG. GULDI:

Yeah, it's going to be more dilute.

17

MR. WRIGHT:

It's going to be less than sanitary.

LEG. GULDI:

Yeah, it's less than sanitary. This is a lot cleaner water than domestic.

MR. WRIGHT:

Oh, yes.

LEG. GULDI:

And is not going to require the volume of processing that say scavenger waste or even residential use would.

MR. WRIGHT:

No, it's a fraction of what's --

LEG. GULDI:

And the sole user is the New York Power Authority in connection with its power generation.

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes.

LEG. GULDI:

Motion to approve, and I never vote for these.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Motion to approve by Legislator Guldi, second by Legislator Foley. All in favor? Opposed? It's Approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

LEG. CRECCA:

Motion to adjourn.

LEG. GULDI:

And don't think this is going to be a pattern, guys.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Okay, we're adjourned.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 3:11 P.M.*)

Legislator Joseph Caracappa, Chairman
Public Works & Transportation Committee

{ } - Denotes Spelled Phonetically